

QUALITY REPORT

Nairobi River Basin Biogas Project

GS-1267 · GS · Kenya

Report ID: CM-E2652D20 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2
	Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%	

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, but the evidence base is weakened by many corrective actions and several unresolved safeguard and permanence gaps. Transparency is only moderate because the monitoring period and verifier are known, yet key items such as buffer coverage, reversal handling, and some usage data are missing or inconsistent. Overall, this looks like a mid-quality biogas project with meaningful documentation and reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1267
Sector	biogas
Country	Kenya
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS I.E. version 04
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	7,222 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- A long list of material findings and corrective actions suggests the verification process identified multiple issues that needed fixing.
- Safeguards are weakly documented: FPIC is not found in the extracted record, and the latest documents say safeguards were not mentioned.
- Permanence and leakage are not fully robustly evidenced because reversal events are not addressed and the leakage deduction percentage is not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test, and the VVB is named as Earthood Services Private Limited.

- The verification material lists many findings and corrective actions, including multiple CLs, CARs, and an FAR, which lowers confidence in the robustness of the project controls.

The project has a positive additionality signal because the verification report confirms a barrier test, and the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Private Limited. Leakage is at least addressed in principle through a quantified justification, but the leakage deduction percentage is not stated, and reversal events are marked as not addressed, which weakens permanence confidence. The long list of material findings and corrective actions in the verification material suggests the project required substantial cleanup before acceptance.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period for 2022 and the verifier identity are stated, and the report provides claimed versus verified emission reductions of 7,437 versus 7,222.

- Buffer pool coverage, reversal handling, and the leakage deduction percentage are not stated in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period for 2022 is stated and the report provides both claimed and verified emission reductions, 7,437 versus 7,222. However, key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including buffer pool coverage, reversal treatment, and verified usage rates. The usage monitoring method is described as self-report in the latest record, while an earlier document referenced an annual survey, which adds some uncertainty about consistency.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

+ The project uses a quantified leakage justification, which is better than an unaddressed leakage claim.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and the claimed reductions exceed the verified amount, indicating some over-claim risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline approach and the lack of a recent baseline reassessment. The verified reductions are lower than the claimed amount, which is a modest over-claim signal, though not extreme. The project also relies on a national default for non-renewable biomass, but the extracted record does not provide enough detail to judge whether that assumption is conservative relative to local conditions.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ The record draws on many documents, with 23 documents used and a named verifier, which supports basic documentation depth.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the record contains several unresolved or poorly specified items, including missing buffer pool and reversal details.

Documentation depth is fair because 23 documents were used and the verifier is named, but the extraction confidence is only medium, so at least one key source was not fully readable. The record also shows many corrective actions and several items that remain not fully specified, including buffer pool coverage and reversal handling. The crediting period and monitoring period are both available, but the documentation still appears incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	reversal handling not addressed
● Leakage	quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete, reconciled monitoring package that clearly states the leakage deduction, buffer treatment, reversal provisions, and verified usage data.

→ Resolve the document contradictions by providing a version-controlled summary showing which safeguard, baseline, and crediting-period statements are authoritative and why.

Documents Reviewed

- GS4GG-Annual-Report_v2.0_2022_without_personal_data_31012023.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_31.12.2016 to 30.12.2018_v3.pdf
- Kenya_MP5_CER complete database calculation_public_04062024.xlsx
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_31.12.2014 to 30.12.2016_v4.pdf
- GS_MP4_monitoring_report_ver2_11102021.docx
- GS4GG-Annual-Report_2021-v1.1_without_personal_data_3101023.docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_12.31.2012 to 12.30.2014_v5.pdf
- Kenya_MP4_CER complete database calculation_public_updated(2).xlsx
- Kenya_MP4_CER complete database calculation_public.xlsx
- GS_MP4_monitoring_report_v3.1_tc_18102022(1).docx
- GS4GG-Annual-Report_2019-v1.1_without_personal_data_18082020.docx
- GS_MP5_monitoring_report_v5_10032025_clean_docx.pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.0-Transition-request-form-project-6549_27092022(1).docx
- GS Passport_19.02.2013_v3.1.pdf
- Transition Annex_31.12.2012_v2.2.pdf
- PDD_11.06.2012_v2.4.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1267
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1267
- FVR_GS.VER.23.32-GS-939-DM.pdf
- GS_Nairobi_biogas_VCR_MP4_06012022.pdf
- GS_Nairobi_biogas_VCR_MP4_20221020(1).pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_31.12.2016 to 30.12.2018_v3.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_31.12.2014 to 30.12.2016_v3.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_12.31.2012 to 12.30.2014_v4.PDF
- Validation Report_19.10.2012.pdf

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-E2652D20 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy